



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,803	09/30/2004	Ian David Kachne	A20-068	9636
28156 7590 06/09/2008 COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE, P.C. 714 COLORADO AVENUE BRIDGE PORT, CT 06605-1601				
EXAMINER PRATT, HELEN F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/509,803

**Applicant(s)**

KAEHNE, IAN DAVID

**Examiner**

Helen F. Pratt

**Art Unit**

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42, 47-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1- 42, 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "A survey on the composition of mineral water and identification of natural mineral water" (Luk) in view of Someya and Tuffley (WO02/00043), Lindon (4,325,975), and Mehansho et al. (7,090,878) and Dyrr et al. (WO 01/52672).

The article "A survey on the composition of mineral water and identification of natural mineral water "(Luk) discloses the comparison of sixty mineral water samples from different sources (abstract). The water can contain the addition of minerals, page 309, 1<sup>st</sup> para., line 13. The reference discloses all of the required minerals in various

Art Unit: 1794

amounts. The minerals in groups 3 and 4 are not actually required by the language of claim 1 since zero amounts are listed. The reference to Luk discloses amounts in group 1 and b at within the claimed amounts except for phosphorous (p 311). Claim 1 differs from the reference in the use of phosphorous in the mineral waters. However, Someya discloses that it is known to make a beverage from coral sand, which contains phosphorous (Table 1, 6<sup>th</sup> item). Also, the other minerals are disclosed by Someya. Tuffley discloses a beverage which contains a supplement of minerals in particular amounts of 50 Mg/l of calcium, 45 mg of phosphorous, and manganese glycinate, magnesium glycinate in amounts of from 75 mg. and in amounts of 2.5 mg/l, magnesium in amounts of 5 mg (page 9). Mehansho et al. disclose a mineral fortified water composition containing calcium, iron, zinc, copper, manganese iodine, magnesium (abstract). Lindon discloses a mineralized drinking water continuing strontium, magnesium, calcium and lithium (abstract). The particular amounts are seen as being within the skill of the ordinary worker. Dyrr et al. disclose that 37 elements can be found in water and 24 are essential for proper nutrition and health (page 7, lines 10-30). The discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). In developing a water product containing minerals, properties such as taste and nutrition are important. It appears that the precise ingredients as well as their proportions affect the taste and nutrition of the product, and thus are result effective variables, which one of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize.

As to the other minerals, attention is invited to *In re Levin*, 84 USPQ 232 and the cases cited therein, which are considered in point in the fact situation of the instant case, and wherein the Court stated on page 234 as follows:

This court has taken the position that new recipes or formulas for cooking food which involve the addition or elimination of common ingredients, or for treating them in ways which differ from the former practice, do not amount to invention, merely because it is not disclosed that, in the constantly developing art of preparing food, no one else ever did the particular thing upon which the applicant asserts his right to a patent. In all such cases, there is nothing patentable unless the applicant by a proper showing further establishes a coaction or cooperative relationship between the selected ingredients which produces a new, unexpected, and useful function. In *re Benjamin D. White*, 17 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 956, 39 F.2d 974, 5 USPQ 267; In *re Mason et al.*, 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1144, 156 F.2d 189, 70 USPQ 221. Each ingredient is used for its known function. Nothing has been shown as to a coaction of ingredients that produce anything new or unexpected. Adding particular amounts of ingredients to make a beverage taste good is within the skill of the ordinary worker as this is a method of trial and error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make a beverage containing known minerals in particular amounts as shown by the combined references.

Claim 2 further requires a particular pH for still water, aerated or carbonated water. The pH of pure water is 7. Claim 41 requires that the water is still water with a pH of 7.2 to 7.6. The reference to Mehansho et al. disclose the use of a fortified water

Art Unit: 1794

with minerals to be between 4 and 9.5. Ph's of course can easily be adjusted with acids and bases. Therefore, it would have been obvious to adjust the ph to a required level.

Claims 2 and 42 further require the addition of carbon dioxide. The addition of carbon dioxide to water is old and nothing new is seen in bubbly water. Therefore, it would have been obvious to add a known gas to water for its known function.

Claims 3-12 further require particular concentration of minerals, and claims 13-40 that the minerals come from particular sources. However, these sources are well known and nothing new is seen in their use. It would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker to use food safe sources of minerals. Applicants have not made any claim that they have discovered these particular sources of minerals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use known food safe sources of minerals to make the claimed composition.

Claims 47-48 further require making concentrated preparations of the various groups and adding them to water in particular amounts. However, method limitations are not given weight in a composition claim. Nothing new is seen in the concentration of water which merely requires boiling away particular amounts of water or the use of less water. Certainly, the use of concentrated solutions is more feasible, than large quantities of water. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make concentrated solutions of minerals.

Flavoring compounds and coloring compounds in beverages are so old that they hardly need a reference as in claims 49 and 50 and 51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use known flavorants in beverages.

Claim 52 further requires that mineral water is used in place of other water in the manufacture of beer. However, manufacturing beer is considered to be a method. Minerals are generally contained in water, however, the claims require particular amounts of minerals. Certainly, if it would have been obvious to make an acceptable tasting and nutritive mineral water as above, this water would have been suitable for beer making absent a showing to the contrary. The amounts of minerals in the claimed waters are in such small amounts that they are not readily tasted. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use mineralized water in place of known water that contains minerals when making beer.

Claims 53-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above combined references as applied to claims 1-52 above, and further in view of Jakubowicz (DE19700368).

Claims 53-54 further require adjusting the pH's with organic acids particularly citric and tartaric. Citric acid is extremely well known in beverages and nothing new is seen in its use. Jakubowicz discloses that it is known to use citric acid in beverages (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to add known acids to adjust the pH of beverages as that is the function of an acid.

Claims 55 and 56 further require adding the claimed mineral water to a beverage in particular amounts or to use a concentrate of the mineral water. However, dilution of beverages is very well known as in diluting a concentrate such as orange juice or dried beverage compositions. Jakubowicz discloses adding a concentrated divalent ion salt/citric acid mixture solution to drink ingredients. The particular concentration is seen

to have been within the skill of the ordinary worker. Therefore, it would have been obvious to add concentrated mineral solutions to dilute beverages to any concentration.

Nothing new is seen as in claim 58 of adding concentrated mineral waters to dilute a beverage, as the beverage will be diluted no matter the type of water. As above it is known to mineralize water. Nothing new is concentrating a mineral solution. Therefore, it would have been obvious to dilute a beverage as in claims 58 and 59.

Claims 52, 60 and 61 further require diluting beer and other alcoholic beverages and tea. Mehansho et al. disclose that it is known to flavor water with botanic flavors and tea and hops. No patentable distinction is seen in flavoring water or in diluting a flavorant. Therefore, it would have been obvious to dilute a flavored beverage with water.

### ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 3-31-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that minerals are known to impart an unpleasant taste and that Tuffley and Mehansho teach that particular amounts of minerals can taste unpleasant, and that a flavoring agent is added to mask the taste. However, applicants are trying to duplicate a natural mineral water, and not one which has enough minerals to meet the United States Dept. of Agriculture nutrition tables recommended allowances per day as in Mehansho '878. Also, Mehansho discloses that a flavoring agent can optionally be used, and is needed to mask the metallic taste of iron. However, applicants do not require the use of iron, as in group D. Also, Mehansho discloses that mineral compounds can be admixed at the desired nutrient level (col. 12,



Art Unit: 1794

lines 59-61). This would could require some flavoring, but if some of the minerals as in group C are listed as being in zero amounts there would be no need of flavoring.

These references are combined with Luk as the primary reference to show that mineralized drinking water is well known, and only one mineral is not found in the claimed range. Other references are used to show that that amount of phosphorous is known. Nothing is shown that using phosphorous in particular amounts affects the taste of the composition.

Applicants argue that the claims are to a balance of elements which can result in a good tasting beverage. However, the minerals are all known and are known to be used in the claimed amounts except for phosphorous. Certainly, nothing inventive is seen in adding a little more of one mineral and a little more of another , especially when minute amounts are used which are not considered to be nutritionally supplemental, as in the RDA's.

Applicants argue that there is no reason to combine Luk and Someya. As above, it would have been within the ordinary skill to vary the amounts of elements. Seven elements to vary is not that much. Just as in adding salt, sugar and flavorings to liquids, the amounts can be varied to provide the right balance of taste.

In addition the goal of making a good tasting manufactured mineral water, is not stated in the claims, and is at best a nebulous standard.

It is seen that it is obvious to add known mineral elements to beverages. Phosphorous is a ubiquitous element found everywhere, particularly in soft drinks.

The reference to Jakubowicz is used for what was cited in the last office action in that it is known to adjust the pH of beverages with organic acids.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen F. Pratt whose telephone number is 571-272-1404. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Milton Cano, can be reached on 571-272-~~1398~~. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Art Unit: 1794

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Helen F. Pratt/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Hp 6-7-08